



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/025,002	12/19/2001	Jesse Chienhua Shan		3660

7590

02/14/2005

Chun M. Ng  
4003 47th Ave. S.  
Seattle, WA 98118

EXAMINER
----------

HOFFMANN, JOHN M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1731

DATE MAILED: 02/14/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Notification of Non-Compliant Appeal Brief (37 CFR 41.37)</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/025,002	<b>Applicant(s)</b> SHAN, JESSE CHIENHUA	
	<b>Examiner</b> John Hoffmann	<b>Art Unit</b> 1731	

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address--

The Appeal Brief filed on 24 January 2005 is defective for failure to comply with one or more provisions of 37 CFR 41.37.

To avoid dismissal of the appeal, applicant must file a complete new brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 within **ONE MONTH or THIRTY DAYS** from the mailing date of this Notification, whichever is longer. **EXTENSIONS OF THIS TIME PERIOD MAY BE GRANTED UNDER 37 CFR 1.136.**

1. ☐ The brief does not contain the items required under 37 CFR 41.37(c), or the items are not under the proper heading or in the proper order.
2. ☐ The brief does not contain a statement of the status of all claims, (e.g., rejected, allowed or confirmed, withdrawn, objected to, canceled), or does not identify the appealed claims (37 CFR 41.37(c)(1)(iii)).
3. ☐ At least one amendment has been filed subsequent to the final rejection, and the brief does not contain a statement of the status of each such amendment (37 CFR 41.37(c)(1)(iv)).
4. ☒ (a) The brief does not contain a concise explanation of the subject matter defined in each of the independent claims involved in the appeal, referring to the specification by page and line number and to the drawings, if any, by reference characters; and/or (b) the brief fails to: (1) identify, for each independent claim involved in the appeal and for each dependent claim argued separately, every means plus function and step plus function under 35 U.S.C. 112, sixth paragraph, and/or (2) set forth the structure, material, or acts described in the specification as corresponding to each claimed function with reference to the specification by page and line number, and to the drawings, if any, by reference characters (37 CFR 41.37(c)(1)(v)).
5. ☒ The brief does not contain a concise statement of each ground of rejection presented for review (37 CFR 41.37(c)(1)(vi)).
6. ☒ The brief does not present an argument under a separate heading for each ground of rejection on appeal (37 CFR 41.37(c)(1)(vii)).
7. ☒ The brief does not contain a correct copy of the appealed claims as an appendix thereto (37 CFR 41.37(c)(1)(viii)).
8. ☐ The brief does not contain copies of the evidence submitted under 37 CFR 1.130, 1.131, or 1.132 or of any other evidence entered by the examiner and relied upon by appellant in the appeal, along with a statement setting forth where in the record that evidence was entered by the examiner, as an appendix thereto (37 CFR 41.37(c)(1)(ix)).
9. ☐ The brief does not contain copies of the decisions rendered by a court or the Board in the proceeding identified in the Related Appeals and Interferences section of the brief as an appendix thereto (37 CFR 41.37(c)(1)(x)).
10. ☒ Other (including any explanation in support of the above items):

As to 6) above - the reference to the Sematech evidence (page 6, line 15 of Appeal Brief) must be deleted - see 37 CFR 41.37(c)(1)(ix) which states "Reference to unentered evidence is not permitted in the brief. AS to 4) the explanation does not refer to the specification by page and line number. It is noted for 5) the Issue E has a typo - it fails to include claim 20. For 6) - the 112 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph rejection of "being raised" needs to be discussed in the appropriate section (i.e. Section VIIB) (simply referring to section VIIA is insufficient because it does not refer to definiteness. As to the Bazylenko rejection it is noted that the first action points out where Bazylenko teaches the high density plasma (i.e. claim 5 of Bazylenko). As to 7) at least lines 6-7 of claim 11 are incorrect: applicant is required to review each claim to remove all such errors: this is not to be interpreted as an indication that this is the only error in the claims.

John Hoffmann  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit: 1731

2-11-05